

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

GEORGE CAMERON AND JANIN
CAMERON, Country Mutual Insurance
Company claimants, and all others similarly
situated throughout Washington State and the
United States of America.

Plaintiffs,

V.

COUNTRY MUTUAL INSURANCE
COMPANY, an insurance company, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C24-2147RSM

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Motion for Protective Order, Dkt. #39.

“The court may enter a proposed stipulated protective order as an order of the court if it adequately and specifically describes the justification for such an order, it is consistent with court rules, it does not purport to confer blanket protection on all disclosures or responses to discovery, its protection from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles, and it does not presumptively entitle the parties to file confidential information under seal.” LCR 26(c)(2).

1 The Court finds that the proposed Protective Order does not conform to the above
2 requirements. The parties have attempted to use the Court's Model Protective Order as a
3 template. Under the section entitled Confidential Material, the Court's Model Protective Order
4 instructs: “[t]he parties must include a list of specific documents such as ‘company’s customer
5 list’ or ‘plaintiff’s medical records;’ do not list broad categories of documents such as ‘sensitive
6 business material.’” The parties have listed the following categories of confidential documents:
7 “personal and financial information pertaining to plaintiffs or other insureds and proprietary
8 business information.” Dkt. #39 at 2.

9
10 The Court finds that the parties have impermissibly left the door open to labeling a wide
11 variety of documents as confidential. “Proprietary business information” is as impermissibly
12 vague as “sensitive business material.” The parties submit no argument to justify a departure
13 from the model protective order’s guidelines. Accordingly, this Motion will be denied.

14
15 Having reviewed the briefing, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby
16 finds and ORDERS that the parties’ Model Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. #39, is DENIED.
17 The Court advises the parties to come up with a specific list of confidential documents and to re-
18 submit this motion.

19 DATED this 5th day of June, 2025.
20
21

22 
23 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25
26
27